



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,642	12/27/2005	Alessandro Sette	EPI - 103X	5117
23557	7590	12/05/2008		
SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			EXAMINER	TONGUE, LAKIA J
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/05/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/537,642	Applicant(s) SETTE ET AL.
	Examiner LAKIA J. TONGUE	Art Unit 1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 45-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 65 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 45-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/07 and 4/20/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 30-40 (which correspond to newly added claims 45-64) and SEQ ID NO: 1, in the reply filed on August 5, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 45-65 are pending. Claims 1-44 have been canceled. Claims 45-65 have been added. Claim 65 has been withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions. Claims 45-64 are currently under examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on April 2, 2007 and April 20, 2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and has been considered. An initialed copy is attached hereto.

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62 and 64 are objected to because of the following informalities: on first sight the acronym "HLA" should be followed by "Human Leukocyte Antigen". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 45-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The rejected claims are drawn to an isolated or purified polynucleotide: a) encoding a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1; b) encoding a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1; or c) that is complementary to the polynucleotide of a) or b). Subsequent claims are drawn to a vector comprising a promoter operably linked to a polynucleotide and a transformed host cell comprising a polynucleotide: a) encoding a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1; b) encoding a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1; or c) that is complementary to the polynucleotide of a) or b).

To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus of polynucleotides or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession of the claimed invention.

A representative number of species means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

The specification lacks a full description of which polynucleotide, vector and transformed host cell comprising a polynucleotide will encode any HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1 or its complementary polynucleotide. The specification is silent with regard to which specific immunoepitopes are capable of encoding any HLA binding

fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1 or its complementary polynucleotide. The specification discloses SEQ ID NO: 1, but does not provide structure correlated with function.

As evidenced by Greenspan et al. (*Nature Biotechnology* 17: 936-937, 1999), defining epitopes is not as easy as it seems. Greenspan et al. recommends defining an epitope by the structural characterization of the molecular interface between the antigen and the antibody is necessary to define an "epitope" (page 937, column 2). According to Greenspan et al., an epitope will include residues that make contacts with a ligand, here the antibody, but are energetically neutral, or even destabilizing to binding. Furthermore, an epitope will not include any residue not contacted by the antibody, even though substitution of such a residue might profoundly affect binding. Accordingly, it follows the epitope to which any given antibody binds can only be identified empirically. Even using a competition assay, the skilled artisan cannot determine whether an antibody binds the same epitope as another antibody because an antibody that competes with another does not necessarily bind the same epitope as the other; rather, one antibody may bind a spatially overlapping epitope to sterically hinder binding of the other.

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the claimed isolated or purified polynucleotide, which encodes a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1 or its complementary polynucleotide. The specification fails to provide any additional representative species of the claimed genus to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601,

1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

The University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404. 1405 held that: ...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and does so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc. , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2datl966.

Further, Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116).

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. *See Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993).

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

5. Claims 55-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The rejected claims are drawn to a transformed host cell comprising a polynucleotide: a) encoding a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1; b) encoding a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1; or c) that is complementary to the polynucleotide of a) or b).

Applicants broadly claim a transformed host cell comprising a polynucleotide: a) encoding a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1; b) encoding a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1; or c) that is complementary to the polynucleotide of a) or b).

These claims read on a cell within a transgenic animal given that the term "isolated" is not denoted in describing the transformed host cell. The breadth of the claim reads on the implementation of the transgenic cell in both *in vitro* and *in vivo* assays.

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could not predict the phenotype of transgenics. For example, Overbeek (1994, "Factors affecting transgenic animal production," Transgenic animal technology, pages 96-98) taught that within one litter of transgenic mice, considerable variation in the level of transgene expression occurs between founder animals and causes different phenotypes (page 96, last paragraph). The art of transgenic animals has for many years stated that the unpredictability lies, in part, with the site or sites of transgene integration into the target genome and that "the position effect" as well as unidentified control elements are recognized to cause aberrant expression of a transgene (Wall, 1996 Theriogenology, Vol. 45, pp. 57-68). The elements of the particular construct used to make transgenic animals are also held to be critical, and they must be designed case by case without general rules to obtain good expression of a transgene; e.g., specific promoters, presence or absence of introns, etc. (Houdebine, 1994, J. Biotech. Vol. 34, pages 269-287, specifically page 281). Furthermore, transgenic animals are regarded to have within their cells, cellular mechanisms that prevent expression of the transgene, such as methylation or deletion from the genome (Kappell, 1992, Current Opinions in Biotechnology, Vol. 3, pp. 548-553).

Well-regulated transgene expression is not frequently achieved because of poor levels or the complete absence of expression or leaky expression in non-target tissues (Cameron, 1997, Molec. Biol. 7, pages 253-265, specifically page 256, col. 1 -2, bridg. parag.). Factors influencing low expression, or the lack thereof, are not affected by copy number and such effects are seen in lines of transgenic mice made with the same construct (Cameron, 1997, Molec. Biol. 7, page 256, lines 3-9). With regard to the importance of promoter selection, Niemann (1997) states that transgenic pigs made with different promoters regulating expression of a growth hormone gene give disparate phenotypes - one deleterious to the pig, the other compatible with pig health (Niemann, 1997, Transg. Res. 7, pages 73-75, specifically page 73, col. 2, parag. 2, line 12 to page 73, col. 1, line 4).

Examples in the literature aptly demonstrate that even closely related species carrying the same transgene construct can exhibit widely varying phenotypes. Mullins (1993, Hypertension, Vol. 22, pp. 630-633) states that not all animals express a transgene sufficiently to provide a model for a disease as the integration of a transgene into different species of animal has been reported to give divergent phenotypes. For example, several animal models of human diseases have relied on transgenic rats when the development of mouse models was not feasible. Mullins (1990, Nature, Vol. 344, 541-544) produced outbred Sprague-Dawley x WKY rats with hypertension caused by expression of a mouse *Ren-2* renin transgene. Hammer (1990, Cell, Vol. 63, 1099-1112) describes spontaneous inflammatory disease in inbred Fischer and Lewis rats expressing human class I major histocompatibility allele HLA-B27 and human β_2 -

Art Unit: 1645

microglobulin transgenes. Both investigations were preceded by the failure to develop human disease-like symptoms in transgenic mice expressing the same transgenes that successfully caused the desired symptoms in transgenic rats (Mullins, 1989, EMBO J., vol. 8, pages 4065-4072; Taurog, 1988, Jour. Immunol., Vol. 141, pages 4020-4023). Mullins (1996, J. Clin. Invest. Vol. 98, pages S37-S40) disclose that the use of non-murine species for transgenesis will continue to reflect the suitability of a particular species for the specific questions being addressed, bearing in mind that a given construct may react very differently from one species to another. Thus, at the time of filing, the phenotype of a transgenic cell contained within any animal was unpredictable and could not be prepared for any species. Applicants can obviate the instant rejection by amending the claims to recite the term "isolated" before the recitation, transformed host cell.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 45, 55, 58-60, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Invitrogen catalog (1997, cDNA synthesis and Libraries).

The rejected claims are drawn to an isolated or purified polynucleotide: a) encoding a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1; b) encoding a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1; or c) that is complementary to the polynucleotide of a) or b).

Invitrogen discloses a random primer set that contains every possible hexameric DNA sequence (see page 3). Invitrogen necessarily includes an isolated or purified polynucleotide that is complementary to the polynucleotide of a) encoding a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1 or b) encoding a HLA binding fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1.

Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' composition with the composition of the prior art, the burden is on applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art. See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.

Conclusion

7. No claim is allowed.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAKIA J. TONGUE whose telephone number is (571)272-2921. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Mondesi can be reached on 571-272-0956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJT
8/13/08

/Robert A. Zeman/
for Lakia J. Tongue, Examiner of Art Unit 1645